



Laura Bush  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Program

# 2012 Field Reviewer Handbook

For additional information, contact:

Kevin Cherry at (202) 653-4662

[kcherry@imls.gov](mailto:kcherry@imls.gov)

Mary Alice Ball at (202) 653-4730

[mball@imls.gov](mailto:mball@imls.gov)

Traci Rucker at (202) 653-4689

[trucker@imls.gov](mailto:trucker@imls.gov)

# THE LAURA BUSH 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY LIBRARIAN GRANTS REVIEW PROCESS

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grant field reviewer. We have selected you to review this year's applications because of your expertise in one of the competitive categories of funding for libraries and archives.

The staff at IMLS has prepared this handbook to ensure fair and candid review of all eligible applications. It will provide you with the procedural information you need. Please use it in conjunction with this year's *Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grant Application and Guidelines*.

## THE LB21 PROGRAM

The Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grant (LB21) program provides Federal grants through an annual, competitive process. In the LB21 program:

- Applications are evaluated by peers;
- Evaluations are based on the application's strength in proving that the applicant:
  - Demonstrates impact as defined in the *Guidelines*;
  - Meets applicable evaluation criteria as outlined in the *LB21 Guidelines*;
  - Addresses one of the categories for this funding cycle as explained in the *Guidelines*; and
  - Aligns with IMLS strategic goals

## THE LB21 PROCESS

1. Applicants review the *Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grant Application and Guidelines* and submit proposals to IMLS.
2. IMLS receives the grant applications, checks them for eligibility and completeness.
3. IMLS identifies a pool of field reviewers and assigns at least three appropriately qualified professionals to evaluate each application.
4. Technical field panelists review the applications and submit comments using the online reviewer system.
5. If necessary, IMLS will host a conference call to discuss those proposals that received significant variance in reviewer evaluations.
6. IMLS processes field reviewer comments and scores, and ranks the applications. The ranking will be used to determine which applications are sent to the overview panel.
7. Overview panelists meet in person to consider recommended proposals and make funding recommendations.
8. IMLS Director makes final funding decisions.
9. IMLS staff notifies successful applicants.
10. IMLS provides feedback to all applicants.

## How Your Reviews Are Used

Your comments and scores as a field reviewer are an important part of this process. They will provide the basis for the panel review, directing panelists to the strengths and weaknesses of an application, and helping both panelists and IMLS staff determine which proposals are both highly innovative and offer broad potential impact.

If a panel-reviewed application is not funded, your review comments and panel comments assist the applicant in revising their application for future submission. Applicants whose proposals are not ranked highly enough for panel review will only receive your field review comments. Unsuccessful applicants often use reviewer comments to improve or revise their applications for resubmission.

## APPLICATION REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

### I. FIRST STEPS

IMLS staff will send all 2012 Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grants field reviewers instructions on how to download the proposals assigned to you using the IMLS Applications Online system. Once you have downloaded the proposals assigned to you, you may begin using the IMLS Online Reviewer System to evaluate each assigned proposal. Instructions for accessing the Online Reviewer System are included later in this guide.

To aid you in your evaluations, IMLS makes available the *Technical Panelist Handbook*, which may be found on the IMLS Website under “Reviewer Resources” (<http://www.imls.gov/reviewers/resources.aspx>). In addition to this handbook, there is a series of eight *Reviewer 101* narrated web presentations designed primarily for panel (not field) review, also found at this site. These short presentations include: 1) Overview; 2) Ethics; 3) Process; 4) Evaluation; 5) Comments to Applicants; 6) Online Review System; 7) Panel Day at IMLS; and 8) Administrative Details. (\*Please note that not all aspects of this presentation applies to field reviews as there is no onsite meeting associated with this form of peer evaluation\*)

In addition to these online resources, IMLS staff will contact field reviewers with details on an optional conference call to discuss any questions about the technical field review process.

### TIME REQUIRED

Experienced reviewers estimate that it takes two to three hours to evaluate one application. If you are a first time reviewer, you may need more time. We recommend the reviewing process outlined on the following pages.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Read through your list of applications to see if there are any potential conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest would include either you or a member of your immediate family having a financial interest in whether or not a proposal is funded, or some other reason you feel would prevent you from providing an objective review. If there is a potential conflict, contact IMLS immediately. When you log in to the IMLS Online Reviewer System, you will be asked to verify that you have no known conflict of interest for the proposals assigned to you. Once you have reviewed an application, you should *never* represent the applicant in dealings with the IMLS or other Federal agencies in regard to this grant application or award.

## CONFIDENTIALITY

The information contained in grant applications is strictly confidential. Do not discuss or reveal names, institutions, project activities or any other information contained in the applications. Contact IMLS if you have any questions concerning an application—do not contact an applicant directly.

## APPLICATION COMPLETENESS

Check your applications to make sure that all required information is included. There are page limits on certain sections (10 pages for Narrative, 2 pages for each resume) and IMLS truncates submissions that run longer. ***If any application appears to be incomplete beyond these circumstances, contact IMLS immediately.***

## II. THE ONLINE REVIEWER SYSTEM

All reviewers will use the online reviewer system to submit their comments and scores. Listed below are the general steps for using the online reviewer system. Please note that the online reviewer system is a legacy system that has a number of flaws. We highly recommend that you read these steps before you start.

When you have completed assigning scores and giving comments for each application assigned to you, you will submit the entire review to IMLS. Please complete and submit all reviews by the deadline.

### Accessing the Online Reviewer System

- Go to <https://e-services.imls.gov/grantapps/reviewers.aspx> and enter the login information provided by IMLS program staff.
- Once you have logged in, an **E-Review** Security screen will appear. Read and click **OK**.
- After you have created a new password your panel assignment will appear. To access the list of applications, click **VIEW**.

INSTITUTE of Museum and Library SERVICES

# Online Reviewer System

[ LOGIN | REVIEW GROUPS ]

Reviewer Login  
Review Groups  
My Online Account  
Log Off

Review Group Code	No. of Applications	Review Status
RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001	5	Incomplete

**VIEW** **PRINT**

Welcome to IMLS review online. Your current review panel assignment is listed above. You will need to complete a review for each application you have been assigned. In order for a review to be considered complete, you will need to give a score and a comment to each review criteria for every application.

To begin, click on the view button, and you will see a list of all the applications you have been assigned to review with their identifying numbers and their completion status. When you have completed **all** of the application reviews you will submit the entire set to IMLS. Then the status for you panel assignment will change from incomplete to submitted.

Thank you for choosing to use the IMLS online review.

- Before you can begin to review any of the applications you must complete a Conflict of Interest Statement. If you have no conflicts of interest with any of the applicants on the list, you may click **Submit Conflict of Interests Statement** (bottom of page) and proceed. If you think that you may have a conflict of interest with an applicant, please contact your assigned IMLS Program Officer.

[ LOGIN | REVIEW GROUPS | REVIEWER APPLICATIONS ]

### Applications List

#### Conflict Of Interests Statement

IMLS Online Reviewer process requires each reviewer to submit a conflict of interests statement prior to reviewing the applications. The conflict of interests statement will be submitted only once.

Please review the details of each application and determine if there are any conflicts of interests. Click on the "Details" button view each application.

If there are no conflicts of interests, leave all check boxes unchecked and 'Conflict Comments' text box blank. The reviewer can return to the individual reviews without going through this statement again.

If there are conflicts of interest for any of the applications, please contact the IMLS staff to discuss your conflict. When the conflict has been resolved, you may return to this website to continue your review. If you will report a conflict of interests, an email will be sent to the appropriate program officer to take further action.

Review Group: RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001

Log Number	Application Title	Institution Name	Application Review Status	Conflicts		
RE-02-12-0001	Digital Information and Content for a Di	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	Details	PRINT
RE-02-12-0002	Digital Curation and Data Credibility: M	Regents of the University of Michigan	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	Details	PRINT
RE-02-12-0003	Doctoral Education for School Library Le	Texas Woman's University	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	Details	PRINT
RE-02-12-0005	LaSCALA: The Latino Scholars Cambio Lead	University of Tennessee	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	Details	PRINT
RE-02-12-0007	The Data-Engaged Librarians Initiative:	University of Alabama	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	Details	PRINT

Conflict Comments:  255 Char.

**SUBMIT CONFLICT OF INTERESTS STATEMENT**

- Now you are ready to begin. You may click **REVIEW** beside any application to begin.

### Applications List

Review Group: RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001

Log Number	Application Title	Institution Name	Application Review Status		
RE-02-12-0001	Digital Information and Content for a Di	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona	Complete	<b>REVIEW</b>	PRINT
RE-02-12-0002	Digital Curation and Data Credibility: M	Regents of the University of Michigan	Complete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0003	Doctoral Education for School Library Le	Texas Woman's University	Complete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0005	LaSCALA: The Latino Scholars Cambio Lead	University of Tennessee	Complete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0007	The Data-Engaged Librarians Initiative:	University of Alabama	Complete	REVIEW	PRINT

**I AM READY TO SUBMIT THIS REVIEW TO IMLS**

- The navigation bar appears on the left of your screen. Click on the items listed to go to a specific place in the application. Click on View App Details to display the Face Sheet.

The screenshot shows a web application interface. On the left is a navigation bar with links: Reviewer Login, Review Groups, Reviewer Apps, Application Scores, My Online Account, and Log Off. Below these are expandable sections for 'RE-Alignment with IMLS Strategic Goals', 'RE-Needs Assessment', 'RE-Impact', 'RE-Diversity', 'RE-Project Design and Evaluation Plan', 'RE-Project Resources: Budget, Personnel and Management Plan', 'RE-Communication Plan', and 'RE-Sustainability'. At the bottom of the navigation bar is 'Application Overview'. The main content area has a top navigation bar with links: HOME | LOGIN | REVIEW GROUPS | REVIEWER APPLICATIONS | APPLICATION SCORES. Below this is a 'Review Scores' section for application 'RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001 Application RE-02-12-0001 Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona'. It includes a 'View App Details' button (circled in red), a 'Print App' button, a 'Review Criteria' dropdown set to 'RE-Alignment with IMLS Strategic Goals', a 'Score' dropdown set to '0', and a 'Comment' field with a 'Check Spelling' button. The main content area below is a large blue rectangle.

- The Face Sheet provides basic information about the applicant.

The screenshot shows the 'Face Sheet' form. On the left is a navigation bar with links: Face Sheet, Checklist, Abstract, Narrative, Schedule, Project Budget, Digitization Specs., Partnerships, Resumes, Attachments, and Print Application. The main content area is titled 'Face Sheet' and contains the following information:
 

- Project Title:** Digital Information and Content for a Diverse Society: A Hybrid Distance/Residencies PhD Program
- Log #:** RE-02-12-0001
- Project Type:** 02 - L21-Doctoral Programs
- Grant Period:** 07/01/2012 - 06/30/2016
- Institution Name:** Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona

 Below this is a tabbed interface with tabs: Applicant Info, Project Director, Authorizing Official Info, Other Info, and Show All. The 'Applicant Organization' section contains:
 

- Organization Name:** Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona
- Mailing Address:** P.O. Box 3308
- Mailing Address 2:**
- City:** Tucson
- State:** AZ
- Zip:** 85722-3308
- URL (Web Address):** arizona.edu

 The 'Funds' section shows:
 

- Amount Requested:** \$ 482,193.00
- Amount of Matching Funds:** \$ 162,509.00

 A note states: 'The amounts below are read-only. They are automatically calculated from information entered in the Project Budget section.' Below this is a note: 'You can enter data for each tab before moving to the next tab, or you can view all the data fields by using the "Show All" tab.' A legend indicates '\* = Required field'. At the bottom, a 'REMEMBER:' section lists:
 

- Save changes frequently. For security purposes, the system will timeout after 15 minutes of inactivity.
- Each of the Review Criteria must be assigned a positive integer score and must have a comment of at least 30 characters entered in order to be considered complete.
- Reviewers represent by submitting this review that they do not have a conflict of interest with the applicant.
- Reviewers can leave and come back during the process.

- Click on the evaluation criteria on the left of the screen to begin entering your comments. Use the drop-down menus for Review Criteria and Score and the text box for comments as you move through the sections of each proposal, saving your work as you proceed and clicking Next to move to the next section.

Reviewer Login [ HOME | LOGIN | REVIEW GROUPS | REVIEWER APPLICATIONS | APPLICATION SCORES ]

Review Groups  
Reviewer Apps  
Application Scores  
My Online Account  
Log Off

**Review Scores**  
RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001 Application RE-02-12-0001 Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona  
View App Details

Review Criteria: RE-Alignment with IMLS Strategic Goals Score: 0 Go

Comment: Check Spelling

RE-Alignment with IMLS Strategic Goals  
RE-Needs Assessment  
RE-Impact  
RE-Diversity  
RE-Project Design and Evaluation Plan  
RE-Project Resources: Budget, Personnel and Management Plan  
RE-Communication Plan  
RE-Sustainability  
Application Overview

2000  
Please make sure that the Score value is selected and that the length of the Comment is between 30 and 2000 characters.  
Save Save & Close Cancel  
Prev Next

- When you have completed submitting your comments and scores for all of the review criteria, you be able to provide general comments about the proposal as a whole on the Application Overview section. In addition, check Yes or No to answer Funding Priorities Addressed? Funding priorities are synonymous with the IMLS Strategic Goals.

**Review Scores**  
RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001 Application RE-02-12-0001 View App Details

Funding Priorities Addressed? No: Yes: ☒

Application Overview Comment: Check Spelling

2000 Char. left  
Please make sure that the Score value is selected and that the length of the Comment is between 30 and 2000 characters.  
Save Save & Close Cancel  
Next



- Once you have completed an application review you must click the **Save & Close** box at the bottom of the screen. This will return you to the **Applications List** and allow you to choose another application to review.
- Once you submit your reviews, you cannot go back in and make revisions. To do so, you must contact IMLS and we will authorize your re-entry into the system so you can make changes. However, prior to submitting your reviews, you can repeatedly enter and exit the system without losing your information.
- After evaluating all of your assigned proposals, click on I Am Ready to Submit.

Applications List					
Review Group: RG-RE-02-2012-FR-001					
Log Number	Application Title	Institution Name	Application Review Status		
RE-02-12-0001	Digital Information and Content for a Di	Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona	Incomplete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0002	Digital Curation and Data Credibility: M	Regents of the University of Michigan	Incomplete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0003	Doctoral Education for School Library Le	Texas Woman's University	Incomplete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0005	LaSCALA: The Latino Scholars Cambio Lead	University of Tennessee	Incomplete	REVIEW	PRINT
RE-02-12-0007	The Data-Engaged Librarians Initiative:	University of Alabama	Incomplete	REVIEW	PRINT
<div>I AM READY TO SUBMIT THIS REVIEW TO IMLS</div>					

## Online Reviewer System FAQs

### **Background:**

This system was created several years ago with a Microsoft based platform. While state-of-the-art at the time of development, it has not been updated. The system still works, but it can be frustrating at first. Once you have a few reviews underway it should prove an efficient process for managing and submitting your reviews. Below are some common user questions.

### **What web browser should I use?**

Since this was created several years ago by a Microsoft based web developer, Internet Explorer is the only reliable web browser. Unfortunately, Mac users and those using Mozilla Firefox, Apple Safari, Camino, and Opera will most likely **not** be able work with our review system. Also we have heard that Microsoft Vista does not work well either.

Our recommendation is to use Internet Explorer 6.0 or later. We suggest that you write and save your comments in a word processing program, then once you get into Internet Explorer and the IMLS reviewer system you can cut and paste your remarks in the proper place.

**Do any of the buttons for assistance work? What if I forget my password?**

No. Please contact IMLS staff for help if you need your password reset or have any other problems.

**What is the best way to get started or comfortable with the system?**

Shortly after receiving your packet, try logging into the system and entering some practice remarks to get a feel for the set up and information display. Then, as your deadline approaches, you can focus on the substance of your reviews rather than the process of entering the information.

Test out the system early and try to do it between 9:00am and 5:00pm so we are available to assist you.

**Keeping Copies of Your Reviews and Assigned Proposals**

Keep your applications and a copy of your reviews until June 30, 2012 (in case of questions from IMLS staff).

- Maintain confidentiality of all applications that you review.
- After June 30, 2012, destroy or delete all copies of these documents in your possession.

### III. EVALUATING APPLICATIONS

The IMLS online review system will require you to provide summary evaluative comments and to assign a numeric score (1-5) for each of the eight review criteria.

For your evaluative comments about each of these criteria, please consider the following questions:

#### *IMLS 2012-2016 Strategic Goals*

You should also assess how well the proposal aligns with the IMLS 2012-2016 strategic goals as detailed in *Creating a Nation of Learners*, available at [www.imls.gov/plan](http://www.imls.gov/plan). The five strategic goals are:

1. IMLS places the learner at the center and supports engaging experiences in libraries and museums that prepare people to be full participants in their local communities and our global society.
2. IMLS promotes museums and libraries as strong community anchors that enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.
3. IMLS supports exemplary stewardship of museum and library collections and promotes the use of technology to facilitate discovery of knowledge and cultural heritage.
4. IMLS advises the President and Congress on plans, policies, and activities that sustain and increase public access to information and ideas.
5. IMLS achieves excellence in public management and performs as a model organization through strategic alignment of IMLS resources and prioritization of programmatic activities, maximizing value for the American public.

#### *Needs Assessment*

- Does the literature review include relevant research and/or projects?
- Does the needs assessment clearly articulate the project audience and its needs?
- Do project activities and goals directly address the needs of the identified audience?
- Is the rationale for this research fully explained?

#### *Impact*

- Does the project increase the number of qualified professionals for employment as librarians?
- Does it build greater skills and abilities in the library and archives workforce?
- Will it contribute to results or products that benefit multiple institutions and diverse constituencies?
- Will project outcomes meet library service needs not only in the communities served but also be generalizable to libraries of similar size and type?
- Will this project transform practice? Innovative approaches will be given high consideration.

### *Diversity*

- Does the proposal identify the diversity of communities served?
- Does it address the library service needs of those communities, particularly the needs of traditionally underserved groups and/or communities?

### *Project Design and Evaluation Plan*

- Are the methodology and design appropriate to the scope of the project?
- Does the proposal clearly articulate research questions and adequately address timeline & personnel?
- Does it include details of sampling logic (size, scope), data collection and analysis methodologies?
- Does the evaluation plan explain how the results are likely to be valid, reliable or generalizable?
- Does the evaluation plan include a description of how the study results will be assessed?

### *Project Resources: Budget, Personnel and Management Plan*

- Are resources appropriate to meet the project goals?
- Do personnel have appropriate experience and will they commit adequate time to the project?
- If the project includes a partnership, is there evidence that all partners are active contributors to and beneficiaries of the partnership activities?

### *Communication Plan*

- Will results, products, models, findings, processes, and benefits of this project be communicated effectively to the library field and to other professional organizations and communities?
- Do the communities described in the Needs Assessment section benefit?

*Note: Collaborative Planning Grants do not require a Communication plan.*

### *Sustainability Plan*

- Do the project's benefits continue beyond the grant period?
- For projects involving distance education, do project plans address issues of copyright and use restriction on the course and course content during and after the grant period?
- Are there plans for preservation and maintenance of course and course content during and after the expiration of the grant period?

*Note: Collaborative Planning and National Forum Planning Grants do not require Sustainability Plans.*

The Online Reviewer System also requires that you provide a numeric score for each evaluation criteria. The following rating scale should be used for this purpose. As you assign numeric scores, please make sure they are supported by the corresponding evaluative comments. The scores you may assign are:

***Excellent (5)*** – The applicant’s response provides **excellent** support for each of the evaluation criteria through the proposed activities. It strongly demonstrates potential to elevate or provide strategic impact to museum, archival, and library practice within the context of national strategic initiatives. These applications fulfill to the fullest extent the goals of the LB21 program. Use only for the highest quality applications.

***Very Good (4)*** – The applicant’s response provides **very good** support for each of the evaluation criteria through the proposed activities. Some minor flaws exist that are easily fixed. Strategic impact is present, but not exemplary. Use for very strong applications when minor requested changes easily can be made within one week.

***Good (3)*** - The applicant’s response provides **good/adequate** support for each of the evaluation criteria. Limited strategic impact and/ or innovation presented. Projects with a “good” rating have a good idea but with flaws that may or not may not need some revising before being funded in this year. Use for applications when more significant requested changes can be made in one week.

***Some Merit (2)*** - The applicant’s response provides inadequate support for the proposed activities, however the application shows **some merit** and should be reworked and resubmitted, taking into consideration recommendations and feedback from the review panel. A rating of “some merit” indicates the submission is not ready to receive funding, but is based on good ideas or addresses important issues. Use for projects that can be revised and resubmitted to LB21 by this applicant next year.

***Do Not Fund (1)*** - The applicant’s responses provide insufficient information for evaluation; projects have major flaws that render them unfundable without major revision or have serious conceptual flaws. The idea itself is not necessarily bad or the issues raised not important, but the application is not fundable by IMLS in the Laura Bush 21<sup>st</sup> Century Librarian Grant program. It may be fundable in another IMLS grant category. Use for projects that you do not want to see brought back to LB21 by this applicant.

As you assign a numeric score to each section of the proposal:

- Use whole numbers only
- Do not use fractions, decimals, zeros, or more than one number

After you have finished providing evaluative comments and a numeric score for each section of the proposal, the IMLS Online Reviewer System provides a section named “Additional Comments” where you can provide feedback that may not be tied to a specific evaluation criterion.

## **QUALITIES OF A GOOD PROPOSAL**

A good LB21 proposal should:

- Demonstrate impact as defined in the *Guidelines*
- Successfully address each criterion
- Address goals for the appropriate category (Refer to the *Guidelines*.)
- Align with IMLS strategic goals

## **READ APPLICATIONS**

Read your applications to develop a feel for the range of responses. Take notes as you read. Read each application again.

## **WRITE COMMENTS**

Reread the evaluation criteria. Draft comments that reflect your judgment for each of the evaluation criteria. Write them in a word processor and then cut and paste into the online review system.

Submit final scores for assigned applications no later than the deadline. Please remember to print a copy of each completed review to keep for your files.

If you have other questions about reviewing, please contact Kevin Cherry at (202) 653-4662 or Mary Alice Ball at (202) 653-4730 or Traci Rucker at (202) 653-4689.

## **GOOD COMMENTS**

Some of the characteristics of good comments are:

- Presented in a constructive manner
- Concise, specific, easy to read and understand
- Specific to the individual applicant
- Reflect the professionalism of the reviewer
- Correlate with the rating that is given
- Acknowledge the resources of the institution
- Reflect the application's strengths and identifies areas for improvement

*Remember:* Successful and unsuccessful applicants use your comments to improve their awards or future applications!

## POOR COMMENTS

Comments that are considered poor are vague, irrelevant, insensitive, or unclear. These comments actually hinder the evaluation process rather than help it.

To avoid making poor comments, DO NOT:

- Penalize an applicant because you feel the institution doesn't need the money—remember, any eligible institution may apply for and receive LB21 funds, regardless of need.
- Penalize an applicant because of missing materials, unless you have determined that the materials are missing from the original application. If you are missing *required* materials, contact IMLS immediately.
- Make derogatory remarks—offer suggestions for improvement rather than harsh criticism.
- Question an applicant's honesty or integrity. You may question the accuracy of information provided by the applicant; if you are unsure how to phrase your concerns, contact IMLS.